

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

3 * * *

4 SAUL WILLIS, JR.,

5 Plaintiff,

6 v.

7 CITY OF LAS VEGAS, *et al.*,

8 Defendants.
9

Case No. 2:12-CV-001214-APG-CWH

ORDER

(DKT. #44)


10 The State of Nevada moves to dismiss the amended complaint. Willis did not oppose the
11 motion and he therefore consents to it being granted. Local Rule 7-2(d).

12 Moreover, Willis fails to state a cognizable claim against the State of Nevada. Willis's
13 complaint refers to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 as the basis for his claims, but as I explained in a prior
14 order, Nevada is not a suable entity under § 1983. (Dkt. #36 at 7.)

15 I previously granted Willis leave to amend his complaint to add a Title VI claim if he had
16 facts to support it. (*Id.*) It is difficult to discern the basis of Willis's claims but it appears he
17 alleges private companies that had contracted with the United States government to work on a
18 street improvement project harmed him and others in the community by obstructing a right of
19 way under the I-15 freeway. (Dkt. #37 at 10.) Willis has not alleged any facts plausibly
20 supporting a claim for discrimination under Title VI. *See Alexander v. Sandoval*, 532 U.S. 275,
21 278 (2001); 42 U.S.C. § 2000d, *et seq.*

22 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that defendant State of Nevada's renewed motion to
23 dismiss (Dkt. #44) is GRANTED.

24 DATED this 7th day of May, 2015.

25
26 
27 ANDREW P. GORDON
28 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE